

NOV 21 2006

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-18, and 20-32 were pending of which Claims 2, 3, 6, 11-13, 17, 21, and 23-30 were allowed and Claims 1, 5, 7-10, 14-16, 18, 20, 22, 31, and 32 were rejected. Claims 1, 14, 31, and 32 are amended. Reconsideration is requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 5, 7-9, 14, 15, 18, 20, and 22

Claims 1, 5, 7-9, 14, 15, 18, 20, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Song et al. (US 6,552,754) ("Song") in view of Roddy et al. (US 6,648,475) ("Roddy"). Applicant requests reconsideration.

Independent Claims 1 and 14 were amended to recite "an optical integrator positioned to receive the combined light from the first filter and the second filter". Claims 31 and 32 were amended to recite "wherein the optical integrator is an integrator rod".

As is well known in the art, an optical integrator is used to produce a uniform illumination field. See, e.g., Roddy, col. 12, lines 25-28. Thus, any image information that is produced in light prior to the being transmitted through an optical integrator will be destroyed by the optical integrator by the generation of a uniform illumination field.

Song is directed to a laser video projector system in which multiple "optical valve[s] 8 formed from a liquid crystal display panel" are used to generate image information in different colored light prior to that light being combined by the color prism 30, which combines the light and is projected to a screen 50 by projection lens group 40. Fig. 8, col. 7, lines 18-28; and Fig. 4 and col. 4, lines 49-51, 57-58.

Applicant notes that Roddy discloses uniformizing optics 14, shown in Fig. 6, which are described as "a lenslet array or integrator bar" that provides a "uniform illumination field" and is located after the output lens 36. It would not be obvious to use the uniformizing optics 14 of Fig. 6 in Roddy with Song, as the uniformizing optics 14 would destroy the image information produced by optical valve[s] 8 in Song as discussed above. Consequently, the modification of Song to include the uniformizing optics 14 of Fig. 6 of Roddy would render Song unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. Accordingly, Song could not be modified by Roddy as such. See, MPEP §2143.01; and In re Gordon, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

Applicant notes that Roddy also describes the use of uniformizing optics 14 between the light source 12 and the beam splitter 18 in Fig. 5 of Roddy. Using this uniformizing

optics with Song, however, would not result in "an optical integrator positioned to receive the combined light from the first filter and the second filter" as recited in Claims 1 and 14.

Moreover, Applicant notes that Claims 31 and 32 were rejected over the combination of Song, Roddy and Magarill (US 2005/0134811) ("Magarill"), as according to the Examiner, Magarill "teaches integrating the beam output from a color prism." Applicant submits that Magarill does not remedy the deficiencies of combining Roddy with Song. To integrate the beam output from the color prism in Song would destroy the image information produced by optical valve[s] 8 in Song and, thus, render Song unsatisfactory for its intended purpose as discussed above. Accordingly, Song could not be modified by Roddy or Magarill.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1 and 14 are patentable over Song and Roddy (and Magarill) for at least the above reasons. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested. Claims 5 and 7-9 depend from Claim 1, and Claims 15, 18, 22, and 22 depend from Claim 14, and are, therefore, likewise patentable for at least the same reasons.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 10 and 16

Claims 10 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Song in view of Roddy further in view of Morgan (US 2005/0128441) ("Morgan"). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

Applicant notes that Morgan also discloses an optical integrator 112 (Fig. 3), but that Morgan fails to make up for the deficiencies in combining Song with Roddy. Accordingly, Claim 10, which depends from Claim 1, and Claim 16, which depends from Claim 14, are patentable for at least the same reasons as Claims 1 and 14.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 31 and 32

Claims 31 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Song in view of Roddy further in view of Magarill (US 2005/0134811) ("Magarill"). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

As discussed above, Magarill fails to make up for the deficiencies in combining Song with Roddy. Accordingly, Claims 31 and 32, which depend from Claims 1 and 14, respectively, are patentable for at least the same reasons as Claims 1 and 14.

SILICON VALLEY
PATENT GROUP LLP
2350 Mission College Blvd.
Suite 360
Santa Clara, CA 95054
(408) 982-8200
FAX (408) 982-8210

Claims 1-3, 5-18, and 20-32 were pending. For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 1-3, 5-18, and 20-32. Should the Examiner have any questions concerning this response, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (408) 982-8202.

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to the fax number 571-273-8300 on November 21, 2006.

 11-21-06
Attorney for Applicant(s) Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Halbert
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 40,633

SILICON VALLEY
PATENT GROUP LLP
2350 Mission College Blvd.
Suite 300
Santa Clara, CA 95054
(408) 982-8200
FAX (408) 982-8210